even though I don't know what they are, I do know that nowhere in them is any hint of any partisan politics, and nowhere in them is any hint of anything that smacks of what happened in the Alley case.

And that becomes significant, because we had another contested election in Pensacola at the same time as our election, where one of our circuit judges was challenged, and he successfully defended his seat.

So I don't know whether you'll have access to any of that material or not, but the material in that election was vastly different than the one in ours. In that election, he was referred to as one of the liberal judges appointed by Lawton Chiles. His opponent pointed to himself as having worked on the staff of Republican Congressman Joe Scarboro. And Judge Terrell was characterized for the time when he was assistant public defender as having defended some of the worst killers in Northwest Florida.

So there was a vast contrast between the two campaigns. But one of the reasons it is significant is because in listening to some of the criticisms of our campaign and not knowing whether

it's come through in the materials provided to you, the criticism voiced a real distrust of the electorate and the electorate's ability to filter this material and evaluate this material.

And, interestingly enough, in the campaign where Judge Terrell successfully defended himself against what appeared to be a pitch for partisan politics -- criticism of the work he had done as a public defender when he had no choice -- and, interestingly enough, many of the police officers came to me and said, "Roy, wasn't he a public defender when this happened?"

"Yes."

"Well, he didn't have any choice, did he?"

And at least one of the law enforcement

people of the Police Benevolent Association actually
endorsed Judge Terrell.

But the interesting thing was, in spite of two highly contested campaigns -- one of which appealed to partisan politics and were heavily Republican air and criticized Judge Terrell very heavily for the work he had done as an assistant public defender -- the electorate, which a lot of people apparently do not trust, not only filtered it out, but Judge Terrell was re-elected by a roughly

2-to-1 margin. Pat was elected by roughly a 2-to-1 margin. There was less than one percentage point difference in the results of the two elections.

So in spite of the fact that many people distrust the public, the public clearly had the ability to make reasonable decisions.

One of the things that we realized when we started this campaign is that the public is very interested in what goes on in the criminal justice system. They're very interested in what goes on in the court system. And, obviously, county judges have civil jurisdiction; but for the most part, what the public is interested in is the criminal side of things.

As a lawyer, you sometimes become jaded because you see a relatively limited segment of society, and it's usually someone who is dealing with the court system. And in my case, it is very often criminal cases.

So it was not only refreshing but also very gratifying when we got into this campaign to realize that the electorate in our area had a tremendous interest in what was going on; they had a tremendous concern for the effect that crime is having on our community, their families and their

\$ 2.2

children; and that they wanted information, they wanted to know, and they wanted to make a reasoned decision. And it was our feeling that the public is entitled to know information.

As you can probably see from some of the information that's been given to you -- I recognize some of it from a distance, having seen it before; and one of the things we've done is brought a copy of all of the brochures used in the campaign -- is that there is an underlying theme or several underlying themes in Pat's campaign. One is that Pat Kinsey was tough, fair and compassionate. And this was not something that has just come up with the campaign; this was something that was a natural because of the work she'd done at the state attorney's office and how she had handled her cases there.

Another interesting thing during this campaign was that while the local bar association throughout our circuit rallied to Judge Terrell's campaign and worked very hard for him, the same thing did not happen in Pat's election. Both Pat and Judge Green had some supporters, obviously. But never during the campaign was there any sense of outrage, of unfairness, because the local bar

recognized that what we were talking about was how Judge Green was performing his duties.

Another underlying theme of the campaign was holding criminals accountable. Obviously, holding criminals accountable is something any judge should do. Obviously, though, not every defendant is a criminal. A defendant becomes a criminal only after he has been convicted.

A third theme in the campaign was the support of law enforcement. Law enforcement had had the opportunity over a number of years -- in Pat's case, roughly 7; in Judge Green's, 12 -- to see how they performed their duties within the system. And law enforcement rallied behind Pat to an even greater extent than I had anticipated.

For years, we had had people talking with us, saying "She needs to run, we need her as a judge." And we expected some help. But the amount of help we got was unbelievable.

For example, one of the most important things -- and this was mentioned during the campaign. I don't think it shows up in any of the literature, but it was mentioned many times -- was that every court security officer -- not most, not the majority, but every single court security

officer, the people who see judges work every day -- either contributed money, which most of them did, or did volunteer work in Pat's campaign.

Virtually all of the major sign locations -- and I can assure you if you're ever in a campaign, you will get tired of building signs, although it did give me an excuse to buy an air net. But virtually every one of the major sign locations was secured by law enforcement. The signs, for the most part -- the large ones, the 4-X-8s, were installed by law enforcement.

We had law enforcement officers and their families manning phone banks, walking neighborhoods, waving signs. There was a tremendous effort made.

Now, one of the things that obviously made defense lawyers nervous -- and you probably have -- I can tell you have the pamphlet that was put together by the defense lawyers' group in Pensacola. And you probably have seen or will see that my name is on that pamphlet, and I was put on that group. And it quickly became obvious that that group had an agenda and was not willing to look at this objectively. And in many ways you can't blame them.

Defense lawyers have things they want to

do for their clients, they're obligated to do. A

lot of them don't recognize that there's a great

deal of difference between a prosecutor's job and a

defense lawyer's job.

A defense lawyer is an advocate for his client. A prosecutor seeks justice. And it was interesting that many of the defense lawyers who had had absolutely no problem with Pat when she was a prosecutor -- because of the fact she would listen to them and evaluate things they brought to her -- suddenly became very nervous. And I think it was probably due to the support of law enforcement. And to a certain extent it's understandable.

But, obviously, law enforcement was a natural constituency for Pat because of her background with the state attorney's office.

But in evaluating the allegations, what I've tried to do is take each one of them. For example, number one, the campaign literature stated, "Police officers should expect judges to take their testimony seriously." And "Help law enforcement officers by putting criminals where they belong, behind bars," a quote as an excerpt from a paragraph in one of the campaign brochures.

The full text of the paragraph actually

reads, "Law enforcement officers willingly risk their lives every day to protect you. They face the prospect of great bodily harm, even death, when apprehending violent criminals on our streets and in our neighborhoods. After facing these threats, your police officers expect judges to take their testimony seriously and to help law enforcement by putting criminals where they belong, behind bars."

You know, I've looked at that many times since this has come up. We've read the canons.

Obviously, as a former prosecutor, I think everyone expected Pat to run a law-and-order campaign, especially since for years she had both seen the way Judge Green handled law enforcement officers and she'd heard their complaints, and she believed change was needed.

Is there anything wrong with taking a law enforcement officer's testimony seriously? No. A law enforcement officer should be treated like any other witness. Obviously, as I said earlier, not every defendant is a criminal. However, after conviction, it may well be appropriate to put a defendant in jail, because they are a criminal at that point and it's time for them to be held accountable.